

<b>Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/668,606	<b>Applicant(s)</b> PARK ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> Prabodh M. Dharja	<b>Art Unit</b> 2629	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Prabodh M. Dharja. (3)\_\_\_\_\_.

(2) Eric Nus. (4)\_\_\_\_\_.

Date of Interview: 18 December 2007.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference  
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☒ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.

If Yes, brief description: None.

Claim(s) discussed: 1 and 12.

Identification of prior art discussed: Lim (US 2002/0039089 A1) and patent 7,145,539 B1.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

  
Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicant representative and examiner discussed arguments under remark mailed on 10-26-2007 regarding Claims 1 and 12. Examiner suggesting and pointing out with column and line numbers; the argued limitations were disclosed in cited prior art of Lim US patent 7,145,539, represented earlier by US PGPUB 2002/0039089 A1. Applicant attorney suggested to reply with office action (Final), which will give him plenty time to discuss the subject matter with applicant and make final decision. Examiner agreed to send office action per applicant's representative's suggestion.